WILSHIRE'S

Vol. XVII No. VI LONDON, JUNE, 1913 Price 2 Cents

The Californian Situation

WHEN I first went out to California in 1884 the State was then in the throes of the Chinese question, as it was called. Chinamen were coming in unrestricted by the thousands with every steamer, and white men were losing their jobs also by the thousand. Naturally, there was great excitement among Labour, but the capitalists viewed the question with great equanimity. Finally, after California had passed a referendum vote of about 100 to 1 in favour of restriction, Congress passed a Bill preventing the further immigration of Chinese into the United States, and the Chinese question was settled.

This time, however, it is a Japanese question, and it is the capitalists who are excited rather than Labour. Why? Because the Japanese, who were not included in the Chinese restriction Act, are commencing to accumulate money, and are menacing not only the job of Labour, but the job of the California capitalist. In other words, they are buying out the white capitalist, and when they can't buy him out they get him out other ways.

The most objectionable of the "other ways" is for a Jap to pay a high price for a small plot of ground in a hitherto exclusively white farmer's district and then to colonise it with Japs. The white man next door will be sure to wish to sell out and move away, and as no other white man will buy next to a Jap, and as the Japs themselves are combined and will not bid against each other, he is finally compelled to sell his place for a song to his new Jap neighbour next door.

This is a general process going on all over California, and it unquestionably means that California will become finally, if something is not done, like the Sandwich Islands, nine-tenths Jap and one-tenth white. And, what's more, the Jap majority will not be all labourers, nor the white minority all capitalists. The whites will become both a numerical and financial minority.

Not only are the Japs out-generaling the whites in farming, but in many lines of manufacture and merchandising as well. All this naturally adds to the discontent of the middle-class Californian.

The State has now passed a Bill prohibiting aliens from owning farming land. As the Japs, as well as other Orientals, are ineligible by law from becoming naturalised, the Bill automatically prevents them from extending their ownership. Japan has made a protest on the ground that her honour has been touched, and there is some talk of war. But Japan is not ready to go to war over such an incident now. It is certain that she could not at present anyway compel the United States to allow Japs to own land in California. What she may be able to do in another twenty-five years is a different question; but, probably, by that time Australia will be a more tempting tit-bit than California.

One interesting part of the Japanese affair is the fact that Bryan and Wilson, heads of the Democratic Party, the Party advocating the integrity of the sovereign States, have been compelled to abandon their theory and join those who would spell nation with a big N. Japan has very properly replied that if California has insulted her it will not do for Washington to reply that California is a sovereign State, and, therefore, Washington cannot make her apologise, because if that is the case, then Washington should allow Japan to deal directly with California. Wilson in sending Bryan out to California to reason with the State broke with his State's rights traditions for no purpose, for California very promptly ignored Bryan, and has passed a Bill which was an absolute necessity if she is to remain a white State.

Perhaps there are humanitarians who see no reason for not turning the State over to the Japanese, but most of those who are so detached in their view will be found to be people who have neither jobs nor capital to be menaced by the invasion. It is easy enough to be a humanitarian when it costs you neither money, jobs, nor votes to be one.

Questions from Utopia

AN old-time Socialist Utopian writes me that:—

"I read carefully most of what you say, but at the ultimate you break down completely. Like the Anarchists, you have to come to everybody doing as they please or you are bound to advocate some sort of central authority for national distribution, if for nothing else. None of you face that. Who is to say under Syndicalism how much railway fares are to be? How much labour-power used in making bread, say, is to be demanded for so much railway travel?"

As a matter of fact, I don't myself see that the solution Socialists may find to such questions is necessarily so very different from that found by Syndicalists. Engels, and all other Socialists, propose the abolition of the State *after* it is captured; we are then to have the administration of things instead of the government of men. The chief difference is that the Syndicalists propose that the Revolutionary Unions shall abolish the State *before* it is captured.

True, under Syndicalism the Industrial Unions will continue to exist and form the structure of organised industry. Their existence is a guarantee to their members that they can resist oppression if there ever should be any need of such a guarantee.

But even such an orthodox Socialist as Sidney Webb looks for the continuance of labour unions of some sort under Socialism, so that point is not altogether one which differentiates Syndicalism from Socialism.

The Central Body under Syndicalism will be made up of delegates from the Unions, whereas the Central Body of the State to-day is made up of representatives of unorganised men residing in certain specified territorial districts.

But this difference of the make-up of the two bodies will tend decidedly in favour of Syndicalism being able to apportion distribution to the extent that need be more equitably, inasmuch as such a Central Body will be made up of industrial experts.

English Free Press Menaced

IN America when the authorities wish to suppress a newspaper that is obnoxious to them they usually have the Post Office trump up some ridiculous charge against the editor and get him into gaol, or they will find some excuse to withdraw his second-class entry. Either of these proceedings will usually land their victims. When these plans fail to work they will instigate a mob to burn down his place and destroy his machinery and presses. If they cannot hire a mob they will secretly order the police to do the dirty work, letting them know that if the editor's head happens to be incidentally broken the chief will not be displeased. In England, however, when they wish to suppress a paper they are not quite so rough and woolly, but their process is quite as effective all the same.

Just now they are trying to suppress the *Suffragette*. A little over a year ago they were trying to suppress the *Syndicalist*. It is merely a question of which organ, for the time being, happens to be the most dangerous to the stability of things as they are.

They arrested the editors of the *Suffragette* just as they arrested Tom Mann and Guy Bowman, the editors of the *Syndicalist*. And they have arrested the printer of the *Suffragette*, just as they arrested the printer of the *Syndicalist*.

The *New Statesman*, the new weekly published by Sidney Webb and Bernard Shaw, writes as follows:—

"The Crown is now proceeding in the prosecution of certain persons who are charged with conspiracy to cause damage to property, against the terms of the Malicious Damage Act, 1861. With that case, within its proper limits, we have nothing to do here. But there are certain issues which have been raised indirectly by that prosecution; and with these it is urgently necessary for us to be very much concerned indeed.

"In the course of the proceedings when Mrs. Drummond and her friends appeared before the magistrate, Mr. Bodkin gave utterance to several very remarkable obiter dicta. One should not hold Mr. Bodkin responsible for these statements, for it must be presumed that he was only carrying out the instructions of higher powers. Indeed, there is every reason to sympathise with him that it should have been his lot to give voice to official orders (or, shall we say, threats?) which the learned gentleman must have known were of no legal value in the sense that it seems obvious he intended the general public to understand them. Let us consider these points.

"First, Mr. Bodkin stated that, in the opinion of the authorities, the *Suffragette*, the organ of the W.S.P.U., was 'week after week encouraging persons to commit damage against property.' So far he was within the limits of his brief; it was a perfectly legitimate statement of the case, which it will be the business of the prosecution to prove by evidence. But then Mr. Bodkin went beyond his case and made this obiter dictum: 'That organ must be put a stop to.' If, by those words, the learned counsel meant that there is any legal process by which a paper or any printed matter can be censored before it appears, then one can only remark that any student at the Bar will be able to correct such a curious misapprehension. If Mr. Bodkin's masters have any respect for the rulings of Lord Chancellors, they will know that 'the liberty of the Press consists in printing without any previous licence." If the Home Office will deign to read the standard work of Professor Dicey, it will learn that 'such checks and preventive measures are inconsistent with the prevailing principle of English Law, that men are to be interfered with or punished, not because they may or will break the law, but only when they have committed some definite assignable legal offence. Hence . . . no such thing is known with us as a licence to print, or a censorship either of the Press or of political newspapers.'

"That may or may not be a satisfactory state of affairs. But it is the law of Great Britain at this moment. When Mr. Drew was arrested for publishing the *Suffragette*, it was not of the slightest consequence whether Mr. Bodkin had uttered a warning or not. The prosecution had to prove that the paper when issued contained evidence of taking part in the alleged conspiracy. One has not yet heard any attempt to prove that the paper did in fact contain any evidence. Indeed, it can still be sold under the nose of any constable in the land, and is continually so being sold. If a new number is brought out this week, or any subsequent week, there is no legal process of our law by which the editor or printer can be touched, except by proving that it, itself, contains evidence of illegal matter."

The comment of the *New Statesman* reminds me of the old story of the man in gaol sending for his lawyer. After telling him his story, the lawyer exclaims, "Why, man, they can't put you in gaol for that." To which the man replied simply, "But, damn it, I am in gaol!"

It's well enough for the *New Statesman* to say there "is no legal process by which the printer can be touched," but the fact remains that not only has he been touched, but the manager of the National Labour Press, who printed the subsequent number, has also been arrested. And now Ramsay MacDonald, the Labour M.P., offers to become responsible for the printing of the next number of the *Suffragette*, and challenges the Government to put him in gaol. We all remember the story of the very pompous man nearing death and telling the priest not to worry about his salvation, for God would think twice before putting a man of such consequence into Hell.

However, the situation regarding the liberty of the Press in England is really serious, and no joking matter. I think the following letter, which I had in the London *Daily Herald* of May 9, is not drawing it a bit too strong:—

"Perhaps a personal experience of my own as to the effect of the arrest of the printer of an obnoxious paper upon freedom of the Press may be at the moment of interest.

"It may be remembered that a little before this date last year that Tom Mann and Guy Bowman, and the Buck Brothers, their printers, were all convicted and sentenced to prison on account of the publication of the 'Don't Shoot' article in the *Syndicalist*.

"The matter of editing and publishing the paper during their incarceration devolved upon me, and if it had not been for the courage of the *Daily Herald* and the Victoria Press, Ltd., I am free to admit that I might have found it quite impossible to find a printer willing to take the risk of printing the journal.

"I can't say how many different printers I approached with the matter, only to get a flat refusal. Neither Radical printers, nor Government printers, nor even Socialist printers were willing to risk joining the Buck Brothers in their sojourn at Wormwood Scrubbs.

"It was in vain I would explain that it was not the *Syndicalist* as a Syndicalist paper that was under the ban, but the misdemeanour merely lay in the printing of that particular article 'Don't Shoot,' and that I did not propose any reprinting of it or any similar article.

"In fact, I explained that whatever went into the *Syndicalist* would be subject entirely to the censorship of whoever might do the printing job.

"But it was all to no effect. It must be remembered that the coal strike was on then, and Syndicalism loomed very large in the public eye.

"However, by a lucky chance I went into the office of the *Daily Herald*, which then, by the way, had not made its appearance, and there I found people who were willing to print the *Syndicalist*.

"The paper was printed, and nothing was done about it, and it is still making its monthly appearance.

"However, the point is that in the case of the *Syndicalist*, although there was no warning against printing the paper as such, or under that name, nevertheless I could find, after a long search, but one printer in London who would take a chance and print it for me.

"And now that man has been arrested for doing the same thing for the *Suffragette* that he did for the *Syndicalist*.

"True, Mr. McKenna says that there was no warrant for anyone thinking that there was a ban on the printing of the word *Suffragette* at the top of a paper, but we must remember that not only did Bodkin make the threat that he would arrest any printer who should print the paper, but the printer has actually been arrested for doing so, and is now bound over in the sum of £2,000 for two years.

"Now, I would ask what chance there would be next time to get the *Syndicalist*, or any other paper, printed in London

if another 'Don't Shoot' article should appear? If I had so much trouble, over a year ago, to get a printer, how much trouble would a man to-day have to get one?

"Before the *Daily Herald* came to the rescue of the *Syndicalist*, I was seriously considering going to Paris to have it printed.

"I consider the attack of Bodkin upon the *Suffragette* the most dangerous attack on the liberty of a free Press that has occurred in England for half a century, and I am quite certain if people could realise how thoroughly the attack on the *Syndicalist* had already intimidated the printers that the matter would receive much more attention than has yet been given it by those who value free speech."

I should explain that since I wrote the foregoing letter the National Labour Press, which is owned by the Labour Party, printed the next number of the *Suffragette*, and their manager was subsequently arrested for doing so. He gave bonds not to do so again, and this is where Ramsay MacDonald comes on the scene with his offer to print the next number and make a test case of the matter.

Ramsay certainly has the law on his side, and the episode should prove a thorny matter for the Government to handle. He declares that he has no sympathy with suffrage militancy, nor will he allow any illegal matter to appear in the paper; but, as far as all this goes, the manager of the Victoria Press has probably no sympathy with militancy, and thought he had excluded all illegal matter. He was arrested all the same, and had to give bonds not to print any more *Suffragettes*.

NOTE.—As we go to press we hear the women have spurned Ramsay's offer to sacrifice himself if his company were given a three months' contract with the right of censorship, and have managed to find another printer who has braved the powers that be on less onerous terms. The *Suffragette* has again appeared, and the third and last printer awaits the axe to fall. To be concluded in our next.

Mother Jones in Jail

IF there is one woman in America in whom the spirit of Joan of Arc has re-incarnated itself it is Mother Jones. She is the soul of the Revolutionary Unionist movement.

It is simply extraordinary the power this old woman, now in her eighty-first year, has over the working class, especially the coal miners.

When Mother Jones is with the miners on strike, I feel sure that absolutely nothing could break that strike. Unfortunately, the owners feel as I do, for they act upon the theory and almost always get her away from the scene of action some way or other when the fight is at its hottest. In one of the strikes out West they alleged she had small-pox, and put her in quarantine till the trouble blew over. Then they found they had made a wrong diagnosis.

In West Virginia, where they have been having the greatest Labour war in American history over the coal strike, they declared martial law and kidnapped her openly in the streets, and held her two months without trial in defiance of all law and constitution. The old lady, however, is still game, and writes to my wife that she would not have missed the fracas for a million dollars.

Harold West writes in *The Survey*:—

"This old woman, more than 80 years of age, was in the mines when I got there," he said, "and I got to know her well.

"I have been with her when she was compelled to 'walk the creek,' having been forbidden to go upon the footpaths that happened to be upon the property of the mining companies, and denied even the privilege of walking along the railroad track, although hundred of miners and others were walking upon it at the time. She was compelled to keep to the country road, although it was in the bed of the creek and the water was over her ankles.

"I protested to the chief of the guards, saying that no matter what her attitude might be, no matter how much she might be hated, she was an old woman, and common humanity would dictate that she be not ill-treated. I was told that she was an old 'she-devil,' and that she would receive no 'courtesies' there.

"I was with her when she was denied 'the privilege' of going up the footway to the house of one of the miners in order to get a cup of tea. It was then afternoon. She had walked several miles and was faint, having had nothing to eat since an early breakfast. But that did not shut her mouth. She made the speech she had arranged to make to the men who had gathered to hear her, although they had to line up on each side of the roadway to avoid 'obstructing the highway,' a highway that was almost impassable to a wheeled vehicle and on which there was no travel. And in that speech she counselled moderation, told the men to keep strictly within the law, and to protect the company's property instead of doing anything to injure it.

"And this is the old woman whom nearly all the operators in the non-union fields fear, and whose coming among their workers they dread more than the coming of a pestilence. This woman the West Virginia mine-owners put in gaol."

Mother Jones is the original American Syndicalist. There was a time when I thought she was wrong in talking strike so much and vote so little. But I see now that the old lady knew a great deal more than I did as to what were the right tactics to arouse Labour in its strength to right its wrongs.

Just now the particular wrong to right is the illegal and outrageous treatment being handed out to strike leaders all over America. There is but one weapon adequate to cope with capitalist brutality. It is the General Strike. No doubt the time is not yet ripe. Probably, Mother Jones must be imprisoned a few more times, and more heads must be bloodied, but ultimately the General Strike must come to its own.

Industrial Unionism and Syndicalism

By Robert Rives La Monte in *New Review*.

IN the *International Socialist Review* for March, William English Walling points out the obvious truth that there are differences between French Syndicalism and American Industrial Unionism. But he bears down so hard on the differences that his article practically obscures or eclipses the essential identity of the two movements. This can but breed and foster pernicious confusion.

Let us get back to first principles. Social movements are begotten by economic conditions. Like causes produce like effects. At a certain stage of the development of capitalism Socialism inevitably emerges. At some stage in the further development of concentration of capital, and of the gradual demonstration by growing political Socialism of its inefficiency, Revolutionary Unionism under some name is equally seen to appear. Its substance or essence must be the same in all countries. Its details cannot be identical in any two countries, since no two countries have precisely the same present economic conditions and historical traditions.

What gives unity everywhere to Revolutionary Unionism is its determined purpose to use Labour unions not merely to ameliorate working conditions, but to overthrow wage-slavery.

In spite of superficial differences this living spirit of revolutionary purpose unifies French and British Syndicalism and American Industrial Unionism. To forget or even to make light of this underlying identity can but substitute muddle-headed confusion for clear thinking. In fact, it is tantamount to a denial of Economic Determinism.

Because Revolutionary Unionism is the child of economic and political conditions, it differs in different countries. In France the use of machinery on a large scale has not gone so far—nearly so far—as it has in America. France produces a vast quantity of articles of luxury, and in the production of these manual dexterity and skill still count for much. In these respects France is behind both England and America. Hence we find craft differences less obliterated in French Syndicalism. On the other hand, the revolutionary tradition is far more vital and virile in France than with us, while no country in the world has had such an enlightening experience as France of the demoralising and paralysing effects of political ambitions and Parliamentary tactics on the Working Class Movement. As a consequence there is in French Syndicalism a vividly keen

consciousness of the necessity of the spiritual re-birth of the proletariat—the ethical quickening inspired and effected by the daily revolutionary conflict. This idea appears everywhere in the literature of French Syndicalism. Unfortunately, though quite naturally, it is as yet far less common in the literature of American Industrial Unionism.

In spite of Walling's strange anxiety to differentiate, he admits the battle for a different name is as good as lost. He writes: "So that it is possible that what we call 'Industrialism' to-day will also be spoken of as Syndicalism in the future." Why should it not be? If we can use the word "Socialism" in England, France, and America in spite of local differences of organisation and tactics, why not "Syndicalism"?

In my pamphlet, "The New Socialism," I tried to show that there was no necessary conflict between Marxian Socialism and Syndicalism. I think I succeeded. Walling, in his eagerness to establish a distinction where there is no real difference, writes: "The basis of the Syndicalist opposition to the Socialist Party is the belief that 'the State is only an instrument of oppression.' The Socialist view, on the contrary, is that the State is only an instrument of *exploitation*—as long as it remains in capitalist hands."

In the name of common sense what's the difference? The purpose of "oppression" is "exploitation"; exploitation cannot be carried on without oppression. Who cares whether you call the State the instrument of the one or the other?

I am inclined to think that the real reason some of us are so eager not to be called Syndicalists is that some Anarchists in this country have become Syndicalists. If Syndicalism is a good thing, shall we be afraid to say so because Emma Goldman happens to say the same thing? For my part, I am not willing to pay Emma the compliment of thus exaggerating her importance.

But the fact is that the Anarchists did not invent Syndicalism, nor have they since captured it. On the contrary, Syndicalism seems on the testimony of no less distinguished an expert than William English Walling, profoundly to have transformed Anarchism, for he writes the "modern form" of Anarchism "is that of an economic and class-struggle movement." Further on he tells us "the communist Anarchists, led by Prince Kropotkin, and supported in this country by Emma Goldman, have gone over bag and baggage to Syndicalism." If we can rely on Walling, the Anarchists have not captured Syndicalism, but rather Syndicalism has converted the Anarchists from the error of their ways.

Is that a thing to be regretted, or hidden, or apologised for?

It was the hope of the great Socialist philosopher, Joseph Dietzgen, that education (on both sides) would unite and reconcile the Anarchists and the Socialists. In 1886 he wrote: "While the Anarchists may have mad and brainless individualists in their ranks, the Socialists have an abundance of cowards. For this reason I care as much for the one as the other. The majority in both camps are still in great need of education, and this will bring about a reconciliation in good time."

According to Walling, Dietzgen's hope has been fulfilled, Anarchists and Socialists are reconciled in Syndicalism. But the "education" that has reconciled them has not come from books, but from the actual battlefields of the Class War.

It is the glory of Syndicalist tactics that they have thus been able to accomplish the dreams of philosophers and seers.

How the General Strike Brought About Socialism

"Syndicalism and the Co-operative Commonwealth (How we shall bring about the Revolution)." By Emile Pataud and Emile Pouget. Foreword by Tom Mann. Preface by Peter Kropotkin. Drawings by Will Dyson. Translated from the French by Charlotte and Frederic Charles. (The New International Publishing Company, Oxford, England.) Cloth, 3s. 6d. net. Paper, 2s. 6d. Paper edition, post paid to the U.S.A., 65 cents.

THIS book by the two well-known French Syndicalists puts Utopia on the map, and hands us a railway guide of how to get there and enjoy our visit. Get there now, to-day, too, without waiting for any special election excursion train billed to run God knows when, as the late-lamented Taft would say.

The story begins in Paris. A brutal exercise of authority by the police leads to a General Strike throughout all France, which finally turns into a successful revolutionary struggle. I am not sure but that the battle is won rather too easily, yet, on the other hand, solidarity accomplishes wonders. And solidarity, we must remember, is not altogether a matter of organisation and long preparation.

The extraordinary things men do spontaneously when animated by the will to do is often astounding.

It is probably because the authors are Syndicalists, and hence have a truer idea of the future of society than previous Utopia builders, that they have given us a more than usual logical conception. Certainly the book to me is much the most likely picture of what we may expect than anything I have yet read. Bellamy never could interest me in either his "Looking Backward" or "Equality." They were books that I always cheerfully handed over to the other fellow. Morris's "News from Nowhere" interested me merely as a fanciful sketch. But this Utopia of Pataud and Pouget grips one with a sense of reality. It will do a prodigious amount of good in getting those to move who will only move when the vision of the future is put on the cinema for them.

As a minor criticism I would say that the picture of the workers using airships to scatter disease germs among the capitalist-cohorts might well have been omitted. The essence of the book is to show that the workers merely by means of withholding their labour can win their great battle. The authors show this most graphically in their first chapters; and for them in a subsequent chapter, when they represent the capitalists to have had a rally, to defeat them by such fanciful means serves but to weaken the story. The workers require no such extraordinary weapons to win their battle; and, anyway, if airships laden with germs were such deadly weapons, we may be quite sure that the capitalists would also use them.

The incident allows the translators, who are apparently hot anti-vivisectionists, to interpolate a note to the effect that all this serum theory of the authors is a fad, anyway. I disagree with the translators that the serum theory is a fad, quite as much as I disagree with the authors that scattering disease germs is ever likely to win a battle for labour. However, as said, the incident is very minor. The main thing is that the authors have given us a most convincing sketch of how to get Socialism without electing Bergers and such like to Parliament, and have also shown us a most delightful sketch of life under Syndicalism.

Syndicalism and Bergson

By Louis Levine, Ph.D., in the New York *Times*.

THE Frenchman's proud assurance that France leads in the intellectual and social progress of the world would seem more or less pardonable at the present time. Probably not since the times of Rousseau and of the Encyclopædists did Europe and America take such deep interest in the philosophical thought of France, and, surely, not since the days of 1848 did French social ideas and ideals sway men and women of other countries to the extent they do now.

The recent rise of French influence is closely bound up with two movements entirely distinct in character and origin. One is purely philosophical, and originated in the mysterious depths of the heart and brain of one man—Professor Henry Bergson. The other is both practical and theoretical, destructive and constructive, and originated in many hearts and many brains, aspiring and working in common. Its name—Syndicalism—bears no etymological relation to any one individual. It tersely expresses the idea at the foundation of this movement—the supreme social value of the producing group.

Though independent in origin, both movements developed approximately during the same period of time. Professor Bergson's idea was first put forth in 1889 in "Time and Free Will," and developed in 1896 in "Matter and Memory," and in "Creative Evolution" in 1907. The Syndicalist ideas found their first more or less definite expression in 1895, when the General Confederation of Labour was founded, and grew steadily with the growth of that organisation after 1900. And both movements of thought began to stir public opinion about the same time—in the interval between 1906 and 1908.

Undoubtedly Professor Bergson's philosophy has a well-marked revolutionary tendency. It views life as a ceaseless effort toward new forms, and it boldly proclaims its faith in the possibilities of the creative process as a stream carried forward by the pressure of an original impulse (élan) and accumulating on its onward march all its experiences and elaborations. There is, in Professor Bergson's view, a solidarity between past and present and a total incorporation of the past in the present. This idea, when applied to social life, would seem to be but little in harmony with the fundamental Syndicalist ideas of class struggle and social revolution, which, if anything, mean

a break between the past and future and a total destruction of the culture of the past by the civilisation of rising classes.

Besides, it would seem that the philosophy of Professor Bergson has a fundamentally individualistic character. To Professor Bergson the social world is essentially the result of the rational activities of man, the product of man's adaptation to material conditions. As such, society makes no demands on the true self of the individual, and is anxious, on the contrary, to compress the individual into a fixed type obedient to habits and general rules. The social world would, therefore, seem to be an obstacle to be overcome by the creative process, the latter finding its vehicle in the individual revolting against social constraint.

On the other hand, the Syndicalist movement—represented by the organised workers—has but little use for metaphysical ideas, and is animated by sentiments foreign to anyone outside of the movement. To the hard-working men and women who are engaged in the rude struggles of the day, abstruse metaphysics and subtle dialectics are but the frivolous play of idle minds in which they take no interest. Their programme is determined by conditions of life, their ideals by their ideas of human dignity and human solidarity. They fight not because they want to, but because they have to; but, having been driven into the struggle, they are determined to keep it up until they win, no matter what becomes of any and all metaphysical ideas.

It is preposterous, therefore, to speak of any inherent connection between Bergsonian philosophy and Syndicalism. The works of George Sorel are undoubtedly interesting and suggestive, and may be read to great advantage; but they are not representative of the Syndicalist spirit as manifested in real life. Besides, even if they were, they fail in the attempt to construct a real synthesis. All that George Sorel and his associates have accomplished was to call attention to interesting points of contact between Bergsonian philosophy and Syndicalism. But these points are of comparatively less significance and far between along the divergent lines which separate the metaphysical elaborations of the Professor of the Collége de France from the concrete and practical programmes of the workers of the General Confederation of Labour.

Gustave Le Bon's View of Syndicalism

"The Psychology of Revolution." By Gustave Le Bon. (T. Fisher Unwin.) 10s. 6d. net.

LE BON is a most elusive writer. You no sooner feel yourself in accord with him than he will say something in his next line to prove how much you disagree with him. For one to think so clearly on so many points as does Le Bon, and to have such a good general knowledge of both past and present, and then to have admittedly arrived at no definite conclusions, is both singular and significant. Perhaps Le Bon knows just enough to know he don't know. It were well there were others.

The book is at once a history of France since the days just preceding the great Revolution, and at the same time a philosophic treatise on the psychology of men in the mass.

Says the author :—

"Among the events whose study seemed completed was the French Revolution. Analysed by several generations of writers, one might suppose it to be perfectly elucidated. And yet its most positive defenders are beginning to hesitate in their judgments. . . . . Thinkers are wondering whether the present dispensation could not have naturally developed without violence in the course of progressive civilisation."

I take it that almost anyone to-day will agree that a great part of the violence was quite unnecessary, and that without it France would be substantially where she is to-day, but when we analyse the causes that led up to the violence we are bound to admit that the violence seemed necessary, notwithstanding its philosophic inutility.

No doubt slavery would have been abolished in the United States without the bloodshed of the Civil War if only more patience had been exercised on both sides for a few critical years. Certainly, all the life lost in the Boer war was waste. Practically everything the British contended for would have been allowed very shortly by the Boers if they had been more patient and the mine-owners less grasping, and had realised the power of the Boers. But, as Le Bon says, men are creatures of impulse rather than of reason.

"The actors of this great drama of the French Revolution seem to move like the characters in a play. Each says what he must say, acts as he is bound to act. Only, the actors in the Revolutionary Drama differ from those in a play, for they had not studied their parts, which were dictated by invisible forces. And precisely because they were subjected to the inevitable progression of logics incomprehensible to them, we see them as greatly astonished by the events of which they are the heroes as we are ourselves. Although they pretended to speak in the name of reason, reason by no means guided them. The historians who have judged the events of the French Revolution in the name of rational logic cannot comprehend them, since this form of logic did not dictate to them. The past never dies. It is even more truly within us than without us. Against their will, the reformers of the Revolution remained saturated with the past, and could only continue, under other names, the traditions of the monarchy, even exaggerating the autocracy and centralisation of the old system. De Tocqueville had little difficulty in proving that the Revolution did little but to overturn that which was about to fall."

However, while it may be true that the Revolution merely gave the final push to the edifice already toppling, nevertheless it is also justifiable to say that the very obviousness of the imminent toppling induced the effort to complete the topple. While the author has little liking for revolutionists either past or present, yet neither has he any love for the capitalists of the day.

"Our rulers to-day behave as did the ancient conquerors; the vanquished have nothing to hope from the victors.

"Far from being peculiar to the lower orders, intolerance is equally prominent among the ruling classes. Michelet remarked long ago that the violence of the cultivated classes is often greater than that of the people. It is true they do not break street lamps, but they are ready enough to break heads. The worst violence of the Revolution was that of the cultivated bourgeoisie-professors, lawyers, etc., possessors of that classical education which is supposed to soften manners. It has not done so in the present any more than it did in the past. One can make sure of this by reading to-day's advanced journals, whose contributors and editors are largely from the professors of the University. Their books are as violent as their articles, and one wonders how such favourites of fortune can have secreted such stores of gall. The only explanation of their violence is the hope of being remarked by the mighty ones of the day or of creating a profitable popularity."

Nor has Le Bon any love for the present representative political system and its parasites. What he says refers to France ; but it applies equally to other so-called democratic countries :—

"Universal Suffrage really represents a most limited suffrage, and there resides its real danger. The political party committees, having need of docile servants, naturally do not nominate as deputies to the Chamber men gifted with lofty intelligence nor high morality. They must have men without character or social position, and above all docile."

While Le Bon is an unsparing critic of the bourgeoisie and all its doings, nevertheless he has little liking for the workers or sympathy with their aspirations. He, however, sees clearly enough that Syndicalism is bringing in a new factor, the consequences of which he hesitates to pass upon :—

"The most important democratic problem of the day will perhaps result from the recent development of Syndicalism. It has rapidly assumed such enormous development in all countries that it may be called world-wide. It is not like Socialism, a Utopian dream, but is the result of economic necessities. In its aim, means of action, and tendencies, Syndicalism presents no kinship with Socialism. For Socialism would obtain possession of all industries, and have them managed by the State, which would distribute the products among the citizens. But Syndicalism, on the other hand, would entirely eliminate the action of the State, and divide society into small professional self-governing groups of workers. Although despised by the Syndicalists and violently attacked by them, the Socialists are trying to ignore the conflict, but it is rapidly becoming too obvious to be concealed. If

Syndicalism is everywhere increasing at the expense of Socialism, it is because it synthetises certain needs born of the specialisation of modern industry. It is increasing rapidly, and finds Governments powerless before it, able to defend themselves only by yielding to every demand—an odious policy, which may serve for the moment, but which heavily compromises the future.

"It was to this poor recourse that the English Government resorted in its recent struggle against the Miners' Union, which threatened the industrial life of England. We may profitably read the weighty words of Mr. Balfour before the House of Commons :—

"'*The country has never in its long and varied history had to face a danger of this nature and this importance. We are confronted with the strange and sinister spectacle of a mere organisation threatening to paralyse—and paralysing in a large measure—the commerce and manufactures of a community which lives on commerce and industry. The power possessed by the miners is, in the present state of the law, almost unlimited. Have we ever seen the like of it? Did ever feudal baron exert a comparable tyranny? Was there ever an American Trust which held the law and the general community in such contempt? The very degree of perfection to which we have brought our laws, our social organisation, the mutual relations between the various professions and industries, exposes us more than our predecessors in ruder ages to the grave peril which at present threatens society. . . . We are witnesses at the present moment of the first manifestation of the power of elements which, if we are not heedful, will submerge the whole of society. The attitude of the Government in yielding to the injunction of the miners gives some appearance of reality to the victory of those who are pitting themselves against society.*'"

Le Bon quite significantly makes no further remarks upon Syndicalism. He evidently sees in it the power which will bring about the next great Revolution, and is reserving further comment thereon for his next book.

The Soul of the C.G.T.

"The Worker and his Country." By Fabian Ware. (Published by Edward Arnold, London.) 5s. (will be sent post paid to U.S.A. by WILSHIRE'S for $1.30).

FRANCE is unquestionably the country to-day where the theory and practice of revolution is best understood. The French workers have tried about every method of putting labour in the saddle, and their opinion to-day, says Mr. Ware, is that Syndicalism is the only method. Strange to say, until quite recently, Mr. Ware has been the editor of the London "Morning Post," the one paper which above all others appeals to the cultured, fashionable, conservative class. And yet, notwithstanding all this misfortune of an early training, Mr. Ware has broken with all his traditions and written the best and clearest account of the present-day Syndicalist movement in France and its relation to the Labour movement in England that has yet appeared.

"As one looks back to-day over the history of the last century there is something pathetic in the faith of those generations who hailed with an enthusiasm akin to religious fervour each succeeding extension of the Parliamentary franchise, believing that it had exalted the humble and meek in the human brotherhood and had built another span of the bridge over the gulfs of inequality, and had let the light of liberty into the darkness of social captivity. . . . Now a remarkable change has taken place. . . . Finally, even those who still clung to their belief in the common sense of the Representative System, and the justice which it claimed to secure for all, were startled by the great railway strike (in England) of 1911, to be followed by the national strike of the miners in 1912. For many this was their first direct acquaintance with discontent becoming active, taking the remedy in its own hands. . . . Representative Government evidently was no government; it would not take the initiative, which is one of the primary functions of governing. It would move only under pressure, and then no further than it was obliged, to allay public resentment. . . . The miners took their own affairs into their own hands. Having declared a national strike, which as it developed brought more and more of the industries to a standstill, they called upon the Labour Party in Parliament to take no action and leave them to settle the matter themselves directly with their employers. They swept Representative Government aside, from which experience had, they thought, taught them to expect neither the willingness nor the competence to satisfy their demands. . . . Representative Government, which in its final development was the result of a long and bitter struggle of the lower classes to conquer liberty and an equal share in the control of the State, was now regarded by these very classes, or, at any rate, by an important and increasing section of them, as useless for the redress of grievances."

I regret that I have not more space to quote from the book, since it is so packed with information and well-digested thought. The author finds that while France has so well developed the general theory of direct action and repudiation of politics, yet England has been the first to apply the theory to action on a large scale. True, a few years ago the French started a General Strike on the railways, but it was put down by Briand mobilising the troops, and thereby making the railway men subject to the severest penalties if they continued on strike. The order was unconstitutional, and was, in fact, disobeyed by a far larger number of men than is generally known ; but nevertheless it was effective. The author considers the unconstitutional use of the order to mobilise has been a great stimulus to the anti-militarist movement in France. He finds that anti-militarism, in fact, has its base much more in the fear that the Army will be used at home against strikers than in the humanitarian feeling against war in general or in Marxian anti-patriotism. He gives a most interesting account of the formation of the Confédération Générale du Travail by Pelloutier, who died in 1895. The story of Marx and Bakunin and the old International is also told in a way that will open the eyes of many orthodox Marxians if they can only be persuaded to read the other side.

If there is one thing that the French workers may be supposed to know something about it is the inefficacy of armed insurrection, and their annual pilgrimage to the graves of the 30,000 martyrs of the Commune tends to keep up their interest in the matter.

Notwithstanding their fiery nature, you never hear to-day of any French Bergers talking about the necessity of every worker having a musket under his bed, nor of any French Hillquits gassing about tigers on barricades. No, if the French have learned one thing it is not to play the enemy's own game.

These are the resolutions which the C.G.T. passed in 1892 at the Marseilles Congress, and which are renewed annually with little change. Berger and Hillquit ought to paste them in their hats to read whenever they may feel a rush of blood to the head.

"That the people have never derived any advantage from revolution accomplished through bloodshed, which has benefited agitators and the middle class alone.

"That, moreover, in face of the military force placed at the disposal of capital, an armed insurrection would only provide the governing class with a new opportunity of drowning social demands in the blood of the working class.

"That the formidable social organisation at the disposal of the governing classes renders vain and powerless the friendly attempts (i.e., voting—G. W.) at emancipation made by the Social-Democracy.

"That Revolution alone can give economic liberty.

"That the General Strike would lead to triumph the demands of Labour."

Thus runs the thought of the 600,000 united working men of France. No longer do they propose fooling away their time and energy on the dream of voting the capitalist out of power. Nor have they any Berger-Hillquit illusions about either shooting or clawing him out of his barricade.

Economic solidarity, the sole road to liberty, is the motto of the French working class, as it soon will be the motto of England and America.

There is no writer in English who has demonstrated the truth of this better than Fabian Ware.

A Daughter of the People

By Reginald Wright Kauffmann

Author of "The House of Bondage," "Daughters of Ishmael," "Running Sands," etc.

"Comrade Yetta," by Albert Edwards. The Macmillan Co. $1.35. (6s.)

MY one quarrel with "Albert Edwards" is that he is "Albert Edwards." His name is such a good one, and he is such an honour to it, that it annoys me to see him doing good work under a pseudonym. However, the point at issue just now is not the name of the author, but the soul of the latest book that he has written; and about that I feel far more strongly and far more favourably.

Against a background of the foul sweat-shops and teeming tenements of New York's East Side, with oppressed workers and rebelling workers for its mass-action; with Syndicalism and Socialism for warp and woof; this novel is the story of Yetta Razefsky, daughter of a delightful Jewish second-hand bookseller, who has fled persecution in Russia, and who dies when his little girl is only fifteen years old. Her unworthy uncle, who appropriates her wages, forces her into a factory, where she is given the job of a "speeder," to quicken the pace of the other enslaved employees, and where she narrowly escapes the clutches of a professional "cadet." How this happens; how Yetta becomes the friend of the secretary of the Women's Trades Union League; the part she plays in the love affair of that leader, Mabel Train, and Mabel's repeatedly rejected lover, Walter Longman; Yetta's self-education and her rise, by the aid of the Socialist lawyer and journalist, Isadore Braun, to the place of leader among her fellow-workers—all this is told, not only with a power for interesting narrative and for characterisation, but with a sympathy resulting in a charming style and a burning sense of the wrongs of our industrial civilisation, which, even where one disagrees with this or that opinion of the author, touches the entire book with Promethean fire.

Do you think that I am using terms too elaborate? Publishers' advertisers have done that sort of thing until a mere writer hesitates to use most of the words of commendation in the dictionary, and is inclined to damn by faint praise rather than ruin by a full expression of his genuine appreciation. Nevertheless, I shall take a chance. I mean just what I have said.

I remember one evening at Graham Stokes's house, on Caritas Island, when "Albert Edwards" came to my rescue. I had got into a fight with James Shields, who has rechristened himself, even in ordinary life—a course such as "Edwards" has not stooped to follow—"Shaemas O'Sheel." Mr. Shields has mistaken the cloudy East River for the clear St. George's Channel; he has plunged into it and come out a revived Celt, and is all eighteen-eighty-nine art-for-art's-sake. Against him I was maintaining my friend Robert Henri's thesis: "Not Art for Art's sake, but Art for Man's sake"; I was trying to point out to him that there comes a time in every writer's life when he must religiously make choice between what he believes to be good Art and what he believes to be not, in the old sense, "good morals" (which never meant anything), but the good of Man. And just then "Edwards" strolled up and illuminated our beclouded sky with something like this:—

"Perfect Art is the result of having something worth the saying, and of saying that something in the manner perfectly fitted to saying it. The things best worth saying are the things best for Man, and the only manner perfectly fitted for saying them is the manner that Man will most readily understand. The greatest work you can do is to help the race; if what you have written is written so that it does help the race, then you've created Art. That *is* Art for Art's sake, because it is primarily Art for Man's sake. Art for the sake of an abstract thing called Art and above Man or aloof from men is bad art. It is also Tommy-rot."

Well, this is what I recalled in reading "Comrade Yetta." It is the story of the development of a strong and beautiful character; but it is also a story of the Gospel of Class-Consciousness. It is eminently the former; it is pre-eminently the latter. From the point of view of fiction, it is admirably fitted to convey its narrative; but inherent in its narrative is its Message, and therefore it is admirably fitted to conveying its Message, too. That is why "Comrade Yetta" is not Tommy-rot; that is why it is Art.

The Co-operative Movement in England

THE Co-operative movement in England, in which so much stock was once taken by those who thought its growth would eventually mean social transformation, is now being confronted with a new and dangerous competitor, the multiple stores.

As long as the capitalists confined their distributive shops and stores to big central depots the co-operators—who largely confine themselves to the distributive part of production—were safe. But the capitalist is now extending his operations to the stocking of innumerable small shops all under one management. His capital is larger than the Co-operative, and he seems to have better management; at any rate, he is encroaching upon their preserves in an alarming manner. The following is from the London *Daily Chronicle*:—

"About 1,350 delegates from all parts of the British Isles are attending the forty-fifth annual congress of the Co-operative Union, which opened at Aberdeen yesterday.

"The effect of the multiple shop system on the Co-operative movement and the great scheme which is on foot for uniting the Co-operative and trade union movements were dealt with by Mr. James Deans, of Kilmarnock, in his presidential address.

"With respect to the question of co-operation with other 'forces' making for the social betterment of the people, a preliminary conference, he said, had already taken place of representatives of the Executives of the Trades Union Congress, the Executive of the Parliamentary Labour Party, and the united board of the Co-operative Union. Many excellent co-operators viewed these negotiations with much anxiety and aversion, but it was absolutely impossible to prevent such questions arising, and to attempt to suppress them would be fraught with great danger.

"There was no ground for much of the apprehension expressed. He did not believe that anything would be done to endanger the unity and harmony of co-operation. Should there emanate from the proceedings any definite and clear-cut proposals, he asked the co-operators of every shade of opinion to extend to them fair and unbiased consideration.

"Dealing with the future of co-operation, he said some anxiety had been caused by the rapid strides with which the Trust system was advancing. The Trust system of distribution by the multiple shop was coming into closer conflict with co-operation than any other. The extension of those shops had been almost phenomenal. Several of these Trusts, it was stated, possessed over a thousand shops distributed over every part of the country, and it was also affirmed on good authority that between 70,000 and 80,000 of these shops were in existence.

WILL ALL SOCIETIES COMBINE?

"Hitherto co-operative production had been of a purely domestic description, limited to producing goods to meet the requirements of the distributive societies. The scope of production should be widened until it included absolutely all the requirements of the retail societies. When co-operation was faced with the competition of the multiple shop its methods must be as elastic as those of its competitors. The ideal of Mr. J. C. Gray of the formation of a national society which, while conferring a large amount of local autonomy on the individual societies, the total reserves of the federation could be applied in propagating the principles or defending the interests of individual societies, was the only solution of the problem.

"Probably co-operation might face the future in alliance with trade unions. If the latter could organise themselves into a

productive camp to manufacture for the open market at home and abroad the Co-operative Wholesale Societies, for instance, might lend them a great deal of capital. The annual profits in co-operation amounted to something like 12 millions, and a portion of that might be loaned to the trade unions to carry out their productive work. If every co-operator became a trade unionist, and every trade unionist a co-operator, there would be very little difficulty in finding a basis for joint action.

"The report of the Central Board again showed steady progress throughout the movement. The membership for 1912 had increased by 116,361, the share capital by £1,613,033, the trade by £6,785,312, and the profits by £323,787."

It certainly would be a grand thing if the actual trade unionists in the production of goods could unite with the Co-operatives and form One Big Union for production and distribution.

The trade unions are fighting organisations, however, and their funds cannot be invested in the Co-operatives without such a loss of mobility as to practically nullify the object of their accumulation. For instance, the Miners' Union may have a million dollars in their treasury at the beginning of a strike, and yet in a few weeks the treasury may be empty. If they had their money deposited in the Co-operative, and should withdraw a million within a few weeks and without warning it would probably bankrupt the Co-operative.

But the trade unions might invest their goodwill and labour in the Co-operatives upon some well-worked-out plan to mutual advantage.

An International Syndicalist Congress

Now that the transport workers of the Atlantic and the Gulf have joined the I.W.W., it becomes imperative that steps be taken to participate in the International Syndicalist Congress, probably to be held in London, England, in the latter part of September. The transport workers are the means of communicating and visualising international solidarity, and their presence in the I.W.W. places a new duty upon the movement. —*Industrial Worker*, Spokane.

There will be no question as to the seating of the I.W.W. delegates in the London Congress. Industrialist and Syndicalist are synonymous.

How the British Socialists Put in their Time the last Twelve Months

Thomas Kennedy in *Justice*.

With really clever, unscrupulous, and determined leaders the effect of Syndicalist agitation on the Socialist movement in Britain might easily have been far more disastrous than it has been. As it is, while practically the whole time and energy of organised Social-Democrats has been taken up with "the pricking of Anarchist windbags," during the last twelve months the capitalist enemy has steadily pursued the policy of developing the chains of State bureaucracy and governmental tyranny.

Presumably, Mr. Kennedy is suggesting that if Tom Mann and Co. were "really unscrupulous" instead of otherwise that the Social-Democracy of England would have quite perished.

No Bar on Talk about Voting

The New York *World*, in confirming the Socialist contention, expresses surprise that the American people permit public officials to abuse their authority to serve their exploiters. It says :—

"Where do Americans find all the petty despots that they elect to office? How does it happen that these upstarts are so rarely called to account?

"When the sheriff of Cayuga County told Emil Seidel, once the Socialist mayor of Milwaukee, that in his speech at Auburn he must make no mention of the strike in progress there, he was perfectly lawless and impudently tyrannical. When for the sake of peace Mr. Seidel obeyed this outrageous order, he proved himself a better American and a better man than the oppressive officer who by distortion of law and usurpation of power invaded his rights.

"The sheriff of Cayuga has no more authority to muzzle Mr. Seidel than he has to gag the Press or the pulpit. If he were conscious of being in the service of the people he would not think of such a thing.

"Too many functionaries in this country are only nominally in the service of the people. They enforce laws with partiality. They are respecters of persons. They get their inspiration from interested parties. They serve the rich!"

It is very infrequent that such a frank statement of fact is permitted to appear in the editorial columns of any of the larger daily newspapers. Such admissions are dangerous. They are calculated to awaken the workers to a consciousness of their situation.—*Milwaukee Leader*.

The interesting point about all this clubbing of speakers is that it is happening not because the sheriffs fear being voted out of power, but because they fear their masters, the capitalists, will be injured by a successful strike.

It is certainly significant that speakers who ask men to vote are free from molestation of the policeman's club.

Counters for Coin

Cecil Chesterton in the *New Witness*.

A LITTLE while ago I said in these columns that I doubted whether there were many people ouside the Old Guard of the Social-Democratic Federation who were still Socialists. That enterprising and courageous journal, the *Daily Herald*, published my challenge, and urged Socialists to reply to it. They did reply; and what they said fully confirmed me in my opinion. It is true that they all declared that they were still Socialists. But they hastened almost as unanimously to add that nothing would induce them to entrust the ownership and control of the means of production to the State. That is what I call wantonly destroying the usefulness of words.

There is a certain economic and political theory on behalf of which strong arguments have been and can be urged. It is this: that the only permanent solution of our social problems will be achieved by taking the means of production away from the private persons who are at present their legal owners and vesting them in the political officers of the State that they may administer them for the benefit of the whole community. That theory is called Socialism. If you believe in the theory it is natural and proper that you should be fond of the name. But that anyone's affection for the name should survive his belief in the theory (as it quite evidently does in many cases) I cannot conceive.

But that is not the main point I want to emphasise. The main point is this. The theory still exists and still demands a name. If you deprive it of the name it has always borne you commit an act of pure waste; and you do not, in this case, or in other similar cases to which I shall presently refer, even justify your action by making any valuable use of the name you have stolen. If a Socialist does not mean a man who wishes the State to own the means of production, what does he mean? As to that the new "Socialists" seemed quite vague. Sometimes it seemed to mean a man discontented with existing social conditions—that is, a man who is neither a knave nor an ignoramus. I can only say that when I called myself a Socialist I meant by Socialism something explicit, definable, and distinctive, and I am quite certain that until it again means something as explicit, definable, and distinctive it will be no use preaching it.

Established 1900

WILSHIRE'S MAGAZINE

Published Monthly by

Wilshire Publishing Company

GAYLORD WILSHIRE,

Editor.

Subscription, Post Paid to any address in the World, 25 cents or One Shilling per year.

1, CHEAPSIDE, GOLDER'S GREEN, LONDON, N.W.

Printed for the Proprietors by the Twentieth Century Press (1912), Limited (T. U. and 48 Hours), 37a, Clerkenwell Green, London, E.C.